ATTITUDES OF SOCIAL WORKERS IN JUVENILE CORRECTIONAL AGENCIES: A STUDY OF SOCIAL WORKERS IN NEW YORK STATE TRAINING SCHOOLS AND AFTER-CARE FACILITIES

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF ATLANTA UNIVERSITY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

BY

ADAM BATTLES, JR.

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

MAY 1960

28
36

DEDICATION

TO THE MEMORY of my father, Adam Battles, Sr.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is unfortunate, but the sheer weight of numbers precludes my thanking everyone here. Such listing would require too much space.

Very grateful thanks are due to Dr, Benjamin J. Hill, Superintendent of the Otisville Training School for Boys, for his inspiration and support.

I am extremely grateful to Mr. Harry Townsend, Director of Clinical Services, Otisville Training School for Boys, for his guidance and leadership. I also wish to thank Mr. Norman Catlett, Assistant Superintendent of the Otisville Training School for Boys, for his encouragement and support.

I am greatly indebted to Mrs. Genevieve T. Hill, Professor of Social Work, Atlanta University, for her painstaking, and competent guidance. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. Warren Moore also of Atlanta University for his guidance; and to Miss Evelyn F. Perry, Associate Welfare Consultant, New York State Department of Social Welfare.

I must also thank the many social workers, who by sharing with me their experiences and knowledge, helped to make this project a reality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Significance of the Study

Present day correctional philosophy has increasingly emphasized rehabilitative or treatment aims, particularly for juvenile institutions, in contrast to earlier custodial emphases.[1] Progress in the shift from punishment and custody to rehabilitations has been slow but continuous. There are no indications that this trend will reverse.

The increased emphasis on rehabilitation has brought many trained professionals - especially social workers - into training school programs both institutional and after-care. The future promises the addition of more specialists, and hopefully, better use of their knowledge, skills, and techniques. It is difficult to envisage a progressive training school that does not utilize some of these specialists.

Of the trained professionals in the training school program, social workers usually constitute the largest group. It is they who are usually responsible for the individual child's overall treatment plan. It therefore seems that to a certain extent the effectiveness of training school and after-care programs will depend on the readiness of social workers to perform. What do we have to tell us of the readiness of an individual to perform? One way is to view his attitudes toward situations. Klienberg

---

[1]Roger Lind and Robert Vinter, "Staff Relationships and Attitudes in a Juvenile Correctional Institution," (University of Michigan School of Social Work Publication), University of Michigan, (June, 1958), p. 1.

says that an attitude is a readiness to respond.[1]

The researchers, from contact with many training school social workers and administrators, observed a wide range of opinions and attitudes regarding various phases of the training school program. It was felt that some of these attitudes are appropriate for advancing correctional work, whereas others may not be. Therefore, the attitudes possessed by those in correctional agencies should be of interest to all who are concerned with the problem of institutional treatment of delinquents. This was the moving force which led to the project herein described.

It is hoped that this study will be of significance in two ways. First, it is hoped that it will provide an index to the attitudes of social workers in juvenile correctional agencies, which will further help to clarify their role; and secondly, it is hoped that it will serve as a basis for more research in the area of correction.

Purposes of the Study

This was an exploratory study directed toward enhancing the effectiveness of training school and after-care rehabilitative programs. Emphases were placed on social workers involved in such situations. It was not intended to evaluate any phase of any training school program; the latter is an important task, and one which is needed in most training schools, but this investigator had neither the time nor the resources with which to undertake such a project.

The study was intended to secure information that would identify

---

[1] Otto Klienberg, Social Psychology (rev. ed.; New York, 1952), p. 482.

selected social workers' attitudes toward, training school goals, role of the social worker in such settings, and suggestions for improving services. Another purpose of the study was to determine to what extent these attitudes are consistent with officially defined concepts of the training school. Finally, it was intended to secure information that would determine to what the attitudes seem to relate:

A. Personal characteristics: age and sex.

B. Factors in education and experience.

Method of Procedure

In order to obtain the necessary information, the researcher used two major methods: (1) interviewing and (2) administering questionnaires. The purposes of the interviews were to determine broad areas of concern. The interviewer asked non-specific questions concerning the training school. Some of the questions generally asked in an indirect way were as follows: What is the purpose of the training school? What are social workers supposed to do in such settings? What is needed to improve conditions of present-day training school programs? The interviews were conducted early in the study process. Approximately thirteen social workers were interviewed. The responses obtained from the interviews were used to construct specific questions for a questionnaire which was administered later.

A three page questionnaire was sent to each of the social workers involved in the study sample. Provisions were made for the respondents to return the questionnaires at no cost to themselves. A complete list of questions included in the questionnaires is presented in Appendix A.

(The respondents were given ten days within which to return the questionnaire; no follow-up was conducted.) The analysis was made on the basis of fifty-one replies made by April 4, 1960. Approximately fifty per cent of the questionnaires sent out were returned. (It was felt that the number of returns was adequate to carry out the purpose of the study.) Young has said that the sender of a well constructed questionnaire may expect from five to ten or at the best twenty per cent returns, depending on how carefully the list of informants are selected.[1]

Scope and Limitations

The locale of this research was all State Training Schools and after-care facilities in New York. There are eight of these schools - six for boys and two for girls. In addition to the resident positions in the training schools, there are after-care facilities throughout the State. There are approximately ninety social workers employed in all of the training schools and after-care facilities.

The study has several limitations. Since the study was concerned with only one State, it is highly probable that conditions peculiar to the State of New York alone may have influenced the findings. For example, the special treatment facilities in New York which are not commonly found in most states may have had some affects on the findings included in the study. Not all of the training schools within the State of New York operates exactly alike. This, too, probably influenced the findings included in the study.

The difficulty encountered in measuring attitudes from information

---

[1]Pauline V. Young, Scientific Social Surveys and Research (New York, 1939), p. 157

received from the questionnaire method creates a limitation in a study of this type. In reference to this Jacobs says:

> A high degree of precision cannot be obtained in measuring attitudes by the questionnaire method. Attitudes cannot be observed or measured directly; they are reflected by the nature of the momentary situation, and it is difficult to interpret them without knowledge of the conditions under which the measurement was taken. The reliability of information obtained from questionnaires is always subject to question, since both the questions and answers are open to subjective interpretations.[1]

The study is limited in that the responses obtained may not, in some cases, reflect attitudes, but opinions instead. According to Klienberg attitudes and opinions usually go together, but not necessarily. He also states that in a good deal of research and practice the two terms have been used interchangeably and that this situation has resulted in conflicting definitions of the two terms.[2] In this research the terms were used interchangeably. This, it is clear, constitutes a limitation in the study. Efforts were made to resolve this problem but it is not contended that such was accomplished. Briefly then, more adequately stated, the study is concerned with both attitudes and opinions.

In view of the fact that some of the questions were of the open-end type, some difficulty was encountered in analyzing the responses.

---

[1]Tina Clarie Jacobs, "Attitudes of Social Workers Toward Fees," Social Casework, XXIII (May, 1952), p. 151.

[2]Op. cit., p. 482-483.

CHAPTER II

THE NEW YORK STATE TRAINING SCHOOL SYSTEM[1]

In the late 1790's there was a severe yellow fever epidemic in New York City. This epidemic created special problems of relief. Some of these problems were the support of fever stricken victims, the needy family of those disabled by the disease, and orphans of victims of the disease.

In 1797 the first child-caring agency in the State of New York was established. It was known as the Ladies Society for Relief of Poor Widows with Small Children. This agency was established for the purpose of helping surviving dependents of fever victims. Similar organizations were established in succeeding years in Albany (1804), and other cities.

The above mentioned agencies were not special child-caring institutions. In fact, the growth of special child-caring agencies proceeded very slowly. Delinquent, dependent, neglected, and other children who had problems were indiscriminately placed in isntitutions together.

This practice of indiscriminate placing of children with problems came under severe attack from progressive-minded citizens and organizations. Demands were made for proper classification and segregation of different groups of dependent and delinquent children. In response to these demands the first juvenile reformatory in America was established

---

[1]For most of the material in this chapter the writer is indebted to Sidney Zirin. See: Sidney Zirin, Otisville Training School: The First Year, (Unpublished Masters thesis, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, 1959), pp. 7-17.

in New York City in 1824.

> The design of the proposed institution is to furnish in the first place an asylum in which boys under certain ages who become subject to the notice of our Police, either as vagrants or houseless or charged with petty crimes may be received, judiciously classed according to the degree of depravity or innocence, put to work at such employment as will tend to encourage industry and ingenuity, taught reading and writing and arithmetic, most carefully instructed in the nature of their moral and religious obligations, while at the same time they are subjected to an energetic and prompt correction of their vicious propensities and hold out every possible inducement to reformation and good conduct.[1]

Soon after the House of Refuge was established, similar institutions were created all over the nation. They usually had bars and tall surrounding walls. They concentrated on uniform regimentation of children for their programming. In spite of their physical limitations and inadequate staff, these institutions were concerned with meeting the individual child's needs. This was done through patient handling, education, and spiritual guidance.

The congregate system, as it was called, was soon to face severe criticism because it was contended that the needs of the children were not being met. At the same time a new and different system was gaining favor in Europe. This was the Cottage System of Child Care. It first originated in Germany at the famous Rauhe Haus. This system started in a small thatch-roofed cottage near Hamburg, in which care was given for the children who lived in the slum area of that city. Other Western

---

[1]Taken from the report of the Committee of the Society of Pauperism submitted to the Legislature of New York State to organize a House of Refuge in 1824, which was the blueprint for the first training school in the United States. It was called the New York House of Refuge. Cited by Zirin, Ibid., p. 7.

European countries soon followed suit with variations of this system and these ideas soon spread to the United States. This system was not readily accepted in State training schools. In fact, it took almost fifty years before the cottage system permeated a State training school.

The New York State Agricultural and Industrial School at Industry, now called Industry, was opened in 1902 on a twelve hundred tract of land twelve miles from Rochester, to replace the old congregate Western House of Refuge. Therefore, it can be said that Industry was the first State operated training school in New York.

In 1904 public funds were appropriated to build a new training school to serve New York City. This new school was to replace the old New York House of Refuge which was still operating in New York City. However, it was twenty-eight years later before this school was actually built, because difficulty was experienced in locating a site that seemingly nobody wanted. The situation was that in most cases citizens looked upon a training school as one of the worst things that could become a part of a community. Feelings of this nature in regard to a training school have prevailed down through the years. As late as 1958, Wiltwick School, a private institution, had difficulty finding a site for a new location for the same reason. An almost identical situation occurred in 1958 when it was decided to relocate the State training school of one of our Midwestern States.

Due in part to the first World War, which brought about a shortage of building material and labor, it was not until 1932 that this training (Warwick) School was finally located on its present site near Warwick in Orange County, New York.

The training school for girls was initially established on a cottage plan. It was to serve as a House of Refuge for women between the ages of sixteen and thirty. When the New York House of Refuge became an all male institution, the girls were transferred to Hudson and the older females were transferred to the new women's institution at Bedford Hills.

Until 1947 these three training schools comprised the New York State Training School System. Until 1927 they were administered by Boards of Managers, who were directly responsible for policy-making, budgeting, and appointment of operating personnel. These schools were controlled by the New York State Board of Charities.

The State structure was reorganized in 1927, at which time the new Department of Charities was organized under the State Board of Charities as its operating division. This Board was a policy-making and appointing body. Two years later the name of the Department of Charities was changed to the Department of Social Welfare. This Department was then divested of all but the following institutions: Hudson and Industry which were training schools, Thomas Indian School, a home for dependent Indian children, and the Woman's Relief Corps Home at Oxford, a home for aged women.

The Boards of Managers of these institutions were reorganized into Boards of Visitors. These bodies was vested with inspection and advisory functions only. The Department of Social Welfare was charged with the administrative functions of the Board of Managers.[1] The Superintendents

---

[1]The department shall see that the purposes of such institutions are carried into effect, and to that end shall have all necessary power. Section 412, Social Welfare Law.

of these institutions were appointed by the department with the consent of the Board of Social Welfare subject to Civil Services' rules, and they were answerable to the Department and the Board for operation of these institutions.[1]

This organization of the State system of training schools was still in effect in 1960 with the following additions: Otisville opened in 1955, Highland in 1957, New Hampton, 1958, and the Troy Branch for Girls in 1958. In 1947, the Annex of the State Training School for Boys was added to the system. It served a very small group of very disturbed boys who could not be accommodated in an open program.

Administration of these institutions was vested in the Division of Institutions and Agencies of the Department of Social Welfare under the supervision of a Deputy Commissioner.

The administration in Albany, New York, was directly responsible for making basic policy, such as institution program, rate of intake, and average length of stay. It served as the institution's representation in Albany in all of its relationships with other State Departments as well as out-of-state organizations and the Federal Government.

The central office in Albany functioned as the institution's representative in dealing with the Division of the Budget of the State Government, and the Civil Service Commission in the crucial areas of financing

---

[1]Subject to regulations of the Department, the superintendent of a State Institution in the Department shall: (a) have management of the institution, (b) except as otherwise provided with respect to the treasurer, shall appoint all subordinate officers of the institution; and they shall be removable by him in accordance with the Civil Service Law and Rules, and (c) have the power and duties prescribed by law for the superintendent of the institution under his charge. Section 419, Social Welfare Law.

and staffing. It also provided consultative and advisory services in housekeeping, social service, food handling, engineering, general administration, and education.

The superintendent of each school was responsible for operation of the school under the general policies provided by the Department. His responsibility was to manage the day-to-day operation of the school, as well as to manage the general organization of the training school program. He was responsible for making all the decisions which did not involve broad policy making.

Under the New York State Children's Court Law of 1920 and 1922, a child up to the age of sixteen, who was involved in any offense, ranging from the use of bad language to murder, could be committed to a training school for juvenile delinquents.

The only exception to this rule was that a child not be committed to a training school under the age of twelve unless he committed an act, which under adult criminal law would be a felony. (For example, if a child under the age of twelve set fire to a house, which is a felony under State law, he could be committed to a State training school. If a child over the age of fourteen (later fifteen) committed a crime such as murder, for which an adult could be punished by death or life imprisonment, he, too, could, but did not have to be subject to an adult court.) This really meant that a boy over the age of fifteen accused of being responsible for the death of another person, perhaps in a gang fight, during a robbery, or as a result of a family argument, might be tried in adult court, or receive an adult penalty, depending on the decision of the court.

In actual practice, the Children's Court Law operated in the following manner: Within New York City it was rare that a child under the age of twelve was committed to a State training school, because there were other available facilities such as private institutions for dependent and neglected children. However, outside of New York City, a number of such children were committed to the training school at Industry. It was rare, in New York City, or throughout the State, for a child under the age of sixteen, who committed a capital offense, to be tried in an adult court. Therefore, to all intents and purposes, the training school at Warwick received children between the ages of twelve and sixteen, who had committed anti-social acts and transgressions ranging over a wide sphere of possibilities.

The general process of commitment in New York City was as follows: When it was finally determined by the Probation Division and the Children's Court Judge that a child required institutional care, an effort was often made for placement in one of the voluntary training schools.[1] For New York City these were Lincoln Hall, a Catholic institution, and Hawthorne Cedar Knolls, a division of the Jewish Board of Guardians. Both of these institutions are primarily sectarian. There were also Children's Village and Berkshire Farms; both non-sectarian schools. All of these institutions, however, had selective intake on the basis of personality structure, religion, race, reading grade, or available bed space, as well as on the basis of the "not amenable to treatment" group which, when applied often

---

[1]With approval of the Board of Social Welfare, certain institutions for dependent children could also admit delinquents.

means almost anything. The State schools can only refuse to accept psychotics, mentally retarded, and those physically incapable of being benefitted by the disciplines of such schools.[1]

The three open institutions, Warwick, Industry and Hudson, operated on the cottage plan and were located in rural areas with ample ground. The programs for the children showed variations, but common to all of them was the emphasis placed on education, vocational training, and the provisions for recreational opportunities, both, within the school grounds and in surrounding communities. All three had some type of a home visiting plan, whereby the children at one time or another during their stay, were allowed to visit their families and return by themselves. Common to all, also, was a cottage plan type of dwelling for the children. Clinical facilities at these schools included a psychiatrist, a clinical psychologist, and a few social workers. At Warwick in 1958 there were six social workers for a population of 512 boys.

After-care facilities were well organized, and included foster home programs. Each school had its own staff of social workers located in the area from which it drew its population. Warwick maintained an office in New York City, which was staffed with twelve workers. Not only were these workers responsible for after-care, but they also maintained liaison between the training school and the family of the child.

All children are committed until the age of twenty-one, and may be kept under supervision until then. Only a few do remain until twenty-one because of Rules of the Board of Social Welfare which provide under what

---

[1]Section 431, New York State Social Welfare Law.

circumstances a child may be discharged prior to twenty-one.

In 1955, as a result of the heavy pressure of commitments in New York City, a new training school was opened on the ground of the abandoned Otisville Saniatrium, in Otisville, New York. This was the first new training school (Annex excluded) organized in New York State in twenty-three years. This brought the total number of State operated training schools to four for boys and one for girls.

Since 1955, two additional training schools have been established for boys, and a branch for girls has been established. These are the Highland Training School for Boys, Highland, New York, which was opened in 1957 and serves boys under fourteen years of age, and New Hampton State Training School for Boys, New Hampton, New York, opened in 1958, and serves boys fifteen years of age and older, who need close supervision and long periods of care. The branch for girls is located at Wynantskill. It was opened in 1958.

Until 1956, each State school was responsible for its own after-care program. At that time the Boys Training Schools Home Service Bureau was established. This agency is administratively responsible to the Department of Social Welfare in Albany, New York. It provides after-care supervision for all of the boys' institutions except Industry which has its own after-care department and the Annex boys from Industry. The Home Service Bureau serves boys from the five boroughs in New York City in addition to boys from eleven nearby counties. There are three offices for the counties outside of New York City. They are located in Mineola, Long Island, Yonkers and Middletown. The Home Service Bureau's work begins at the time that the child is committed, by establishing contact with the

family. Its evaluation reports, casework contacts with the family, and parole plans are major factors in determining a child's release. In fact, seldom is a boy permitted to leave the training school for a week-end visit with his family, or parole until the Home Service Bureau has contacted the family.

In the case of boys who are ready to be paroled from the training school but who have no home to which to go, the Home Service Bureau attempts to find foster homes or other suitable outlets. In fact, the Home Service Bureau operates a parole residence unit at Seamens House Y.M.C.A. in New York City, and another such unit is planned for Brooklyn. These units are for boys over sixteen who are going to work, not continuing school.

The Training School Program

To describe the program of each training school operated by the State of New York would not be feasible for several reasons. First, it is not the purpose of this study to produce such a description. Secondly, to produce such a description would of necessity require considerable duplication since all of the training school programs are very similar, and in any event, under the same basic philosophy.

The training school is a community. In the words of Hill the training school is in certain regards a simplified and controlled community.[1]

The training school attempts to meet as many individual needs as possible. To do this the training school has what is called a program.

---

[1]Benjamin J. Hill, "Otisville State Training School for Boys," (Otisville, New York, Otisville State Training School, 1959), p. 1. (Mimeographed.)

Program may be defined in many ways, but an adequate and simple definition given by Catlett is:

> Program is the total activities that a child participates in. It is varied and balanced so as to give each child a cross section of experiences and living conditions such as we would expect him to be offered in a constructive living community situation.[1]

Since each child who comes to the training school is usually within the compulsory school age, some type of educational program is essential. The training school's educational program is varied to meet the needs of all of the children. There is a challenge for the bright child as well as for the youngster who is retarded. Tests are administered to determine the areas of specific needs. Usually each child is interviewed to ascertain his interests and ambitions. The classes are small - sometimes only two students. The standard for all training schools is not over fifteen per classroom. Otisville has a few classes over ten partly because of small classrooms. Since many of the children who come to the training school are retarded in reading, special emphasis is placed on remedial reading. When a child is placed in the academic program, it is usually done on the basis of his reading ability and not on the grade level in which he was placed in the public school. Introductory trade training activities such as auto mechanics, carpentry, barbering, plumbing, printing, and business education are offered. On-the-job training is offered in connection with various work activities associated with

---

[1]Norman Catlett, "Care and Training Guides and Goals for Staff of The Otisville Training School," (Otisville, New York, Otisville State Training School, 1958), p. 2. (Mimeographed.)

maintaining the institution. In the girl's schools, skills in homemaking are taught in addition to academic subjects. Since in most cases the training school represents their last chance to acquire formal education, the children are encouraged to make the most of their educational experiences - many of them do just this.

During the summer the children are given opportunities to participate in such activities as swimming, off-campus trips, recreation, and arts and crafts. These activities are usually supervised by the teachers, since they are employed on a year-round basis.

All training schools have units of about the same size, either in a cottage or other type of building. Some have a dormitory, others have single rooms. Warwick has a combination in each cottage. Each cottage unit is headed by a supervisor or sometimes a man and wife who are known as cottage parents. There are usually several such individuals connected with each cottage unit since the children must be under supervision twenty-four hours a day. The supervisors and cottage parents of each cottage unit provide the basic cottage team that works with the social worker, psychiatrists and teachers.

The clinic, which is an integral part of the training school, is made up of psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, and consultants. Clinic personnel are usually assigned so that they may work with a group of cottages. This method has an advantage in that it facilitates the team's working with the cottage staff both on a formal and an informal basis concerning treatment and programming. Clinic staff are used as consultants by the lay staff for formal and informal in-service training in behavior dynamics and treatment techniques.

The caseload for each clinic worker is usually far greater than that recommended by the United States Children's Bureau, which is thirty.[1] Caseloads of sixty to eighty are frequently found, whereas thirty is usually the exception.

Each child is evaluated at periodic intervals.[2] The time lapse between each evaluation usually depends upon the nature of the child's problem and the school's policy. At the evaluation, one or several of the usual gamut of possible recommendations may be made. A child may be recommended for parole, a visit to his home, transfer to another institution, a new assignment, a change in living quarters, or it may simply be recommended that a child continue his present program.

The training school uses as many community resources as possible. The children are carried to local movies usually without cost to the institution or the children. The training school children compete with boys and girls from the community in such activities as basketball, baseball, and wrestling. In some instances, children attend the school in the community, especially where it is in the best interest of the child.

Children are provided the opportunity to attend religious services of their own faith. The training school has full-time or part-time services of Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant Chaplains. Attention is given not only to formal religious services, but also to counselling by Chaplains.

---

[1]United States Children's Bureau, Institutions Serving Delinquent Children: Guides and Goals, (Washington, 1956), p. 51.

[2]Called Case Conference or Cottage Committee Evaluation.

From time to time children in the training school need medical care. These services are provided by the medical staff which usually consists of a part-time physician, one or more full-time nurses, and a part-time dentist.[1] Special medical referrals are made by using the resources of nearby communities. From the date that the child is admitted to the training school until the date of parole, a complete medical program is carried out. Cooperation between the medical staff and other departments of the training school, especially the Social Service Department, insure that not only the physical needs of the child are met, but the emotional as well.

Children in the training school receive well balanced meals. The meals are prepared by well-trained cooks, who usually work under the supervision of a professional dietitian. As much as possible the children are permitted to select food according to their taste, however, some limitations to prevent unnecessary waste is essential. If a child knows that he does not like a specific food, he is asked not to take it.

Children committed to the training school find that the recreational program offers many opportunities. The recreational activities are as varied and usually as many as can be found in most natural communities. The recreational program is developed by the boys and staff as an essential segment of the training school's treatment program.

---

[1]Some large Institutions have a full-time physician, and dentist; however, this is the exception rather than the rule.

CHAPTER III

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDY SAMPLE

Each social work group of interest in this study can be described with reference to personal characteristics and job responsibilities. General information is given in this chapter. Detail information is presented in Appendix B.

After-Care Workers.--This was the largest group witnin the study sample, consisting of three-fifth: of the entire sample. Questionnaires that were sent to all of the after-care workers, thirty-two returned them.

The workers in this group are responsible for providing casework services to the children after they leave the training schools. They also maintain limited contact with the training school during the time that the child is actually undergoing institutional treatment. In fact, the after-care worker's responsibilities begin at the time that the child is committed to the institution. A complete report of the child's situation is sent to the training school very soon after commitment. Subsequently, reports are sent to the training school prior to each evaluation, especially before the child is returned to the community. The after-care worker is responsible for preparing the family to receive the child when he is discharged.

Four-fifth: of this group was men. The median age of this group was thirty-five years. The median school years completed was eighteen. All had completed at least four years of college education. Four-fifth: of this group had some graduate education. One-third had completed all of

the training required for the Master of Social Work degree. An additional one-fifth had completed at least one year of graduate training in social work. One-tenth had done graduate work in areas other than social work, usually sociology or psychology. The remainder had no graduate training.

The undergraduate majors of those who made up this group represented the usual gamut available at large universities and colleges. Over four fifth majored in one of the social sciences, sociology representing the largest number. One had an engineering background. The mean number of years of social work experience for this group was six and one-half years. This was somewhat higher than the institutional workers.

The tenure median of this group was thirteen months. This too, was higher than the institutional workers. The median age of this group was thirty-five years. Again this is somewhat higher than the institutional workers.

Institutional Workers.--This was the smaller of the two groups in the study sample. It consisted of two-fifth of the study sample. Nineteen institutional workers returned the questionnaires.

The workers in this group are responsible for providing casework services to the children while they are in the training school. They also maintain contact with the child's family by way of the after-care agency. Three-fifth of this group was men. The median age of this group was thirty-four years. This is somewhat lower (one-year) than the after-care group. All of this group had completed at least four years of college education. Four-fifth of this group had some graduate education. Almost one-third had completed all of the requirements for the Master of Social Work degree. An additional two fifth had completed at

least one year of graduate training in social work. One-tenth had done graduate work in areas other than social work. The remainder had no graduate training. The median number of years of education of this group was seventeen. This is somewhat lower than the after-care workers.

Like the after-care workers, the undergraduate majors of this group were varied. However, the vast majority had social science backgrounds. The mean number of years of social work experience for this group was three years. The tenure median of this group was one year.

CHAPTER IV

TRAINING SCHOOL GOALS

Definition of Goals

Statements of training school goals are not very extensive. In general, most of our information in this respect comes from three sources: the United States Children's Bureau, State Legislation providing for establishing and operating such facilities, and from the facilities themselves. In the case of the latter, goal determination is greatly influenced by the parent organization, and the philosophy of the administrator in charge of each facility.[1]

In the language of the Legislative Act presently governing New York State training schools, the purposes of such facilities are briefly stated as . . . "the training and care of children who shall be legally committed there to and for their guidance and supervision on release."[2] The Legislative Act which provides for special institutions for delinquents is more explicit in defining goals. It states that:

> For the better care, treatment, protection and security of juvenile delinquents committed to state training schools who, in the judgment of the Commissioner,[3] require special care, treatment or attention, the Department[4] may establish, operate and maintain in suitable locations, temporary branches of the State training schools.

Publications of the various training schools themselves contain other

---

[1]In the case of this study the parent organization is the New York State Department of Social Welfare.

[2]New York State Department of Social Welfare, Social Welfare Law of the State of New York,(Albany, 1959), p. 169.

[3]Commissioner of Social Welfare.

[4]Department of Social Welfare.

statements of goals. In a pamphlet distributed to the general public the aim of one of the New York State Training Schools was referred to as follows:

> The Otisville State Training School for Boys can be looked upon as a controlled community, and is in certain regards a simplified community. As such, it will make available and utilize some of the positive and negative motivations and pressures of group living. We hope it will be possible to give the poorly socialized child a taste of some of the rewards of social living he may not have been able to achieve outside.[1]

This statement, although from only one of the facilities of the State of New York, is typical of those published by other training schools within the State. The above information regarding goals is concerned with one state - namely, New York - however, a look at the aims of facilities in other states in general gives the same views. Official goals prescribed for the Training School in which Vinter and Lind did their study are custody, training, and treatment.[2]

The United States Children's Bureau, the source of much of our knowledge regarding the operation of contemporary training schools, has this to say in reference to goals of institutions serving delinquent children:

> The goal of institutions for delinquents is to train, re-educate and rehabilitate the children under care and the modern method of accomplishing this is the individual application of an integrated treatment program accordingly.[3]

---

[1]Benjamin J. Hill, "Otisville Training School for Boys," (Otisville, New York, Otisville Training School, 1959), p. 2. (Mimeographed.)

[2]Op. cit., p. 39.

[3]United States Children's Bureau, Institutions Serving Delinquent Children: Guides and Goals, (Washington, 1957), p. 3.

The data presented thus far in this chapter indicate that secure custody and rehabilitation both appear consistently among training school goals. There is little evidence to show which goal is considered more important. Information to the effect that an integration of the two goals exists is also lacking. (For the purpose of this study the goal of rehabilitation will be the chief focus.)

The important question now is the relationship between social work and the training school. Do they have common goals? Are social work knowledge, skills and techniques useful to the field of correction and is the knowledge of correction useful to social work? These questions are significant because, as was indicated earlier in this study social work is becoming deeply concerned with correction.[1]

The premise here is that social work and the field of correction should be concerned with each other because they have common goals, and each can contribute to the realization of the aims of the other.

Viewed by the training school, the goal of rehabilitation has been established with the ultimate aim of adequate social functioning from the standpoint of the individual as the chief focus. This is also true of the more progressive adult agencies.

It is much more adequate to say what the aims of social work are than to define it. In fact, people in the field agree on the former more readily than they do the latter.

Ziskind, in discussing social work and the field of correction, has

---

[1]Corrections as used here refer to the broad area which is concerned with the treatment of juvenile as well as adult offenders.

this to say:

> Social work is the art of helping people to help themselves: to become independent, self-sustaining individuals, to be able to live at peace with themselves and with their community. These objectives are not peculiar to the field of social work along. They are among the objectives of many branches of human knowledge, including medicine, psychology, law, and criminology, but it is not the primary objective of any of these fields. Social work by definition, includes the objectives of rehabilitation. It is essentially the effort of helping an individual to a normal life through the aid of social groups and facilities.[1]

From this statement it seems that social work should be concerned where ever there are human beings with social needs. A person in a training school or an adult institution finds himself in a social situation which he must accept despite his desires to live otherwise. The person in such a situation usually resents it, and even those whom he feels were responsible for having been abscribed such a plight. To help the captive client improve his situation, social treatment of some type is usually available. In discussing this point Trecker says:

> Social treatment is help given to a person designed to bring about a change in his attitude and behavior within a defined social situation.[2]

No reference is made to any particular social situation. He also says that "the aim of social treatment is to bring about better psychosocial functioning of the individual."[3]

---

[1]Louis Ziskind, "Social Work in the Correctional Field," Federal Probation, XIV (March, 1950), p. 46.

[2]Harleigh B. Trecker, "Social Work Principles in Probation," Federal Probation, XIX (March, 1955), p. 8.

[3]Ibid.

These contentions provide a rationale for a close relationship between social work and correction on the basis of common goals. This alone, it seems, should be a sufficient reason for the two to work together.

To go deeper into this discussion a look at other reasons for unity between social work and correction is indicated. Another approach to this situation is by way of what social work has to offer correction and vice versa. The contention here is that both will benefit from an object relationship. In discussing this Johnson says

> Social work has a basic contribution to make correction. More accurately, "correction" must be restored to social work both because it is an important aspect of the profession's responsibility which has been ignored in recent years and because it can be a source of considerable strength to social work concern.[1]

This brings up the question as to where or how the field of correction may be of help to social work. Authority is a concept that is "supposedly" relegated by some social workers, resented by many, but one which, according to Gordon Hamilton, can be used appropriately. Speaking of this, she says

> The psychologically well-equipped worker is not afraid to use authority on a positive basis after it has been diagnosed as appropriate for the individual and the function of the agency.[2]

She also states that

> Authority is a part of social reality which the probation officer must not only accept but learn to use so as to help the client in a positive instead of a negative way.[3]

---

[1]Kenneth D. Johnson, "The Role of Social Work in Preparing Personnel for the Correctional Field," Federal Probation, VXX (September, 1956), p. 54.

[2]Gordon Hamilton, Theory and Practices of Social Casework (Rev. 2nd ed.; New York, 1951), p. 292.

[3]Ibid., p. 292.

It seems then, that some of the confusion in social work regarding the use of authority may stem from a lack of knowledge in this respect. Since correctional agencies, juvenile as well as adult, are considered the most obvious authoritative agencies, it is natural that they are sources of knowledge for social work in the crucial area of authority. Regarding this, Studt maintains that

> Intensive study of social work practice in the field of correction may illuminate the role of authority in treatment in a way that will be useful for all social workers. At the same time, such study may clarify the nature of social work service in a field where authority is central and where heretofore, there has been a good deal of confusion.[1]

The researcher feels that social work can benefit from the field of correction by extensive study in family centered casework. Probation and parole officers are constantly involved with the entire family in their attempts to help clients who are having difficulty with the law. In many cases it is only the delinquent who is known to social agencies, but it does not take the probation or parole officer very long to see that the problem is much broader than what met the surface. Frequently, a family can only qualify for help with a parole or probation agency. In such instances, the worker must do all that he can for the family as a whole, because he knows, as most of us do, that the parent's total behavior, both conscious and unconscious, has a profound influence on the child. Since more emphasis is being placed on family centered casework, it seems reasonable to assume that correctional workers may have something to

---

[1]Elliot Studt, "The Contribution of Correctional Practice to Social Work Theory and Education," Social Casework, VXXVII (June, 1956), p. 264.

contribute. Additional study may be very helpful in this respect.

It is generally accepted that social work can contribute to the field of correction. There is hardly to be found a large correctional agency, juvenile or adult, in which social workers are not utilized. Recent social work recruitment literature has its share of requests for trained social workers. There are no indications that this trend will stop. Speaking of the value of social work to the field of correction, Meeker says

> A wise use of the principles and methods of casework will add immeasurably to the success of a probation officer. Such qualities as a deep understanding of human nature and the forces which direct behavior, a profound belief in the worth of the individual, an objective and genuine desire to be of service buttressed by a real knowledge of resources and how to use them are among the qualifications most needed to succeed in the practice of probation.[1]

---

[1]Cited by Johnson, op. cit., p. 60.

CHAPTER V

SOCIAL WORKERS' CONCEPTIONS OF TRAINING SCHOOL GOALS

The material in the previous chapter was devoted to official definitions of training school goals, and the relationship of social work to correction and correction to social work. The study findings regarding social workers attitudes toward institutional goals will be presented in this chapter. What do they see as training school goals? Are their attitudes regarding goals consistent with officially prescribed goals? These questions are significant in view of the fact that public authorities, who were originally very skeptical of social casework, are beginning to see and use its values. Thus, the attitudes of social workers in correctional agencies, at this stage, are very crucial, both from the viewpoint of social work as well as from the viewpoint of correction.

Interview conducted early in the study process indicated that social workers conceived of treatment goals as being synonymous with training school goals. When asked about these goals social workers were very definite. That is, they were very clear on what they wished to accomplish with delinquent children - they were not in complete agreement as to how to do what they felt should be done. Knowing that the study sample consisted of workers who had varying backgrounds, different types of experience and training, it was felt that their responses might possibly fall along a custody-training-treatment continuum. This, it was later discovered, was not the case.

Questionnaires administered to social workers incorporated phrases actually used by workers during the interviews. Phrases were chosen to give the respondents a wide variety from which to choose. The phrases included custody, training, and treatment items. In data analysis, three major categories were established: (1) treatment, (2) re-education, and (3) correction. Respondents were premitted to check as many of the phrases as they so desired; however, they were told to rate each phrase checked. Thus it was possible to have a respondent who would select eleven phrases ranging in priority from one to eleven. Only a few of the workers rated all of the items, many checked only two, and few checked more than five. The actual phrases used in the questionnaires are grouped as follows:

Treatment

1. Helping the child in his relationships with adults and peers.
2. Helping the child solve basic character and emotional problems.
3. Helping the child to change his adverse attitudes and values.

Re-education

1. Teaching acceptable habits and behavior.
2. Teaching vocational skills and knowledge.
3. Teaching academic subjects.

Correction

1. Deterrent to other children.
2. Protection of the community.
3. Removal from delinquent environment.

4. Deterrent to future delinquency on account of fear of future institutionalization.

5. Punishment.

The system did not lend itself to the selection of multiple goals without giving priority. It was discovered in data analysis that this would hardly have made the study more meaningful since most of the respondents selected goals falling in the same category for all of their choices. The intent was to determine what the social workers viewed as the primary goal of the training school, and if possible how they felt it should be accomplished.

By inference, based upon the nature of the respondents' choices, it seems safe to say that social workers see the training school as a facility for enhancing individual social functioning. From actual data received, by way of questionnaires, the social workers, envisage individualized treatment programs as the most appropriate means of achieving this end. Almost all of the respondents were of this opinion. The data for each social work group are presented in Table 1, according to its conceptions of training school purposes. This table is only concerned with the respondents' first choices. From the table it is clear that almost all of the respondents believed treatment to be the primary goal of the training school. It was felt that difference in social work groups would prevail; however, in the final analysis this was not the case. Thus, levels of graduate training and/or place of employment did not appear to influence the respondents' choices.

TABLE 1

CONCEPTIONS OF TRAINING SCHOOL GOALS

Social Work Groups	No	Goal Conceptions			
		Correctional	Re-educational	Treatment	No Answer
After-care	32	0	1	31	0
Institutional	19	0	0	19	0
Totals	51	0	1	50	0

Personal factors such as age and sex did not appear to influence the respondents' choices. This being the situation, the necessity to organize the workers into groups according to levels and types of graduate training, and personal factors was not indicated. (However, for the purpose of organization, the workers were divided into two groups based upon the place of employment, after-care, and institutional.)

The data indicated consensus on the part of social workers regarding the goal of the training school. They were not, however, in agreement as to how to accomplish this goal. Thirty-three per cent said that they believed help in solving basic character and emotional problems was the best way to reach the goal of treatment. Thirty-four per cent chose changing attitudes and values as the chief method of achieving the goal of treatment. Thirty per cent chose helping the child in relationship with peers and adults. The remainder did not choose a treatment item as their first goal choice. Table 2 gives a numerical description of this

situation. In the table, Item one (A) represents helping the child in his relationships with adults and peers; item two (B) denotes changing attitudes and values, and item three (C) help in solving basic character and emotional problems.

TABLE 2

SOCIAL WORKERS OPINIONS AS TO HOW THE GOAL OF TREATMENT MAY BE ACHIEVED

Social Work Groups	No	A	B	C
*After-Care	30	10	9	11
Institutional	19	6	8	5
Totals	49	16	17	16

A-Helping the child in his relationships with adults and peers.

B-Changing attitudes and values.

C-Help in solving basic character and emotional problems.

*There were a total of thirty-two after-care workers but two selected training items as their first choices.

It was possible for the respondents to have made a total of 561 choices, which allowed each of the fifty-one respondents eleven choices; since there were eleven items. The total number of choices was two hundred and twelve. This is a mean average of four and one-tenth items per respondent. Table 3 shows the number of times each item was rated. This table gives some indication as to the concern given to the various item. The table does not

show the priority given each item. It does show that the respondents expressed about as much concern over protection of the community, and removal of the child from the delinquent environment as they did teaching vocational skills and knowledge and academic subjects.

TABLE 3

INSTITUTIONAL GOALS, NUMBER OF TIMES EACH ITEM WAS RATED

Items	Number
Teaching Vocational Skills and Knowledge	8
Teaching Academic Subjects	11
Helping the Child in his Relationships with Adults and Peers	62
Changing Attitudes and Values	51
Deterrent to Other Children	4
Teaching Acceptable Habits and Behavior	22
Protection of the Community	5
Punishment	2
Removal from the Delinquent Environment	5
Help in solving Basic Character and Emotional Problems	50
Deterrent to Future Delinquency on Account of Fear of Future Institutionalization	2
Totals	212

CHAPTER VI

THE SOCIAL WORKER'S ROLE

Heretofore the emphasis and findings were focused toward institutional goals and attitudes regarding them. The goals of the training school were defined, and the rationale for the inclusion of social workers in the training school social system was established. Now it appears that an analysis of the training school social worker's defined role and his attitudes toward his role should be made.

The acceptance of social work by juvenile agencies has created an interesting situation in regard to the role performed by the institutional caseworker. This situation, which may eventually add another dimension to social casework, is briefly described by the United States Children's Bureau as follows:

> An expanding role is emerging for the institutional caseworker. There has been a gradual shifting from the caseworker's traditional role of a "one-toone" counselling relationship with the child to one of broader responsibility in which the caseworker is intimately related to the entire program as the person primarily responsible for the individual youngster's treatment plan.[1]

This broadens the social worker's role considerably. It means that he must work with personnel as well as clients. It implies that he should act as a consultant who gives help in understanding human behavior. In fact, in many agencies this is expected. Hardman and Hardman commenting on the training school social worker's role, have this to say:

---

[1] Op. cit. p. 51.

> The greatest service a social worker can render in an institution is to help the lay staff understand and fill the children's needs.[1]

It is somewhat difficult to describe the training school caseworker's role because it may vary depending upon the particular institution and official goals defined by the parent body. In some institutions the caseworker may limit his contact to the individual child. In others the majority of the worker's time may be utilized in working with other personnel, especially key personnel. To give a focal perspective to the responsibilities usually placed upon the institutional caseworker, we find our best source in the United States Children's Bureau, where the functions of the caseworker are described as follows:

1. He should gather and evaluate significant material from appropriate sources to be used as a basis for initial (or intake) case conference, and, as a member of the treatment planning committee, aid in planning the treatment program for the individual.
2. He should discuss such material at the conference and share it with other staff members who will be working with the child.
3. He should maintain a continuing relationship with the child, keeping alert to, and calling attention to, imminent or changing needs, and interpreting these to other staff members.

---

[1]Dale G. and Margaret P. Hardman, "Three Postulates in Institutional Care," National Probation and Parole, IV (January, 1958), pp. 22-26.

4. He is responsible for recording the student's progress reports, case conference summaries, reports from the community, and, in general, maintaining the individual records of the students.
5. He should maintain a continuing relationship with the families of the children, geared toward better understanding of the student's problems and improvement of the family relationship, by services as the liaison between the child and all contacts that he has with the outside community, including visits from relatives, emergency home visits, vacation visits, and contacts with other social agencies concerned with the child or his family.
6. He should assist the staff and the local community in becoming more aware of the needs of the children as individuals, by active participation in the in-service training, staff development, and public relations programs.[1]

For some individuals a discussion of the training school social worker's role may terminate here; however, to do so may be taking too much for granted. To define the institutional caseworker's role without viewing a proposal as to how it should be carried out presents only a part of the story. Many suggestions have been made as to what casework in training

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 52.

schools should cover. One that warrants consideration at this point is that proposed by Novick.[1] This does not say that no other plan or plans are worthy of consideration.

Novick, from experience in working with problems peculiar to training school's settings concluded:

> What happens when the typical casework program as seen in the community is applied to this composite picture of the public training school? The caseworker finds comparatively few children who have enough overt anxiety about their behavior to respond to a face-to-fact contact. Most of the youngsters seem to play one role in the casework office and a completely different one in the cottage setting or in any other institutional groups. The effect of the weekly casework contact is minimal in comparison to other institutional influences. This is especially so in referenct to the informal group. The worker, through the individual approach, makes little dent in informal group activities.[2]

This does not imply that it is impossible to treat the training school population . The fact that social work is gaining acceptance in training schools negates this. It does, however, suggest that the casework program must be cognizant of its setting.

For the appropriate use of caseworkers in training schools Novick proposes a plan which covers four broad areas.[3] Briefly the plan maintains that the caseworker should occupy a role which includes:

1. Supervision of Cottage Staff.

   In this phase of the proposed system, the caseworker

---

[1]Abraham G. Novick, "Casework in Public Training Schools for Delinquents," (Paper Presented the 83rd Annual Forum, National Conference of Social Work, St. Louis, Missouri, May 23, 1956.

[2]Ibid., p. 3.

[3]Ibid.

supervises the staff of one or more cottages; the latter being the basic structured group in the training school. The caseworker helps the cottage staff in areas where they are weak and aid them in developing competence in their work.

2. The Cottage Group.

Under the proposed system, the caseworker in this phase of his duties discuss with the children and the cottage staff group, everyday problems which are of great concern to the group. The food in the institution may be a topic for discussion. Why was a certain boy's visit concealed? Should the group be permitted more freedom at dances? These are questions that may be the focusing point of a group discussion. Under the proposed system it is felt that a close relationship develops between youngsters and staff members, and it is felt that the child appreciates the role of the adult more.

3. Activity and Discussion Groups.

Here, it is proposed that the caseworker works with the informal group which forms within the cottage structured group. The intent is to help the subgroup achieve its goals in socially acceptable ways. The approach may be in the form of a discussion, or an activity or a combination of the two.

4. Individual Interviewing.

It is well known that some children need close individual attention. This phase of the caseworker's role takes this into consideration. This process may be in the form of a long intensive process or one or two individual interviews may suffice.

From all of these statements and this proposal it seems that the training school caseworker's role has several dimensions which include working with the child on an individual basis and with other agency personnel, especially cottage staff, maintaining contact with the child's family, and consultation to personnel as well as lay people.

CHAPTER VII

SOCIAL WORKERS' CONCEPTIONS OF THEIR ROLE

Within a social system the role assigned an individual may or may not correspond with that which he conceives for himself. The performer's feelings regarding his role will greatly influence the extent to which the assigned role is played. For the well-being of all concerned, it then becomes significant to know how one feels about what he is expected to do.

Therefore, the material in this chapter is devoted to an analysis of the findings regarding social workers' attitudes toward their role. What do they conceive as their role? Do they continue to hold to the typical casework program as seen in communities agencies? (In what role do they feel that their services will be most beneficial to the delinquent child?) Did they feel that the authoritative nature of the juvenile program constituted a dilemma? Interviews conducted during the study process indicated mixed feelings among social workers in reference to their role. Some said that they were not given enough responsibility to realize their full value to the training school program. Others said that they were required to involve themselves in too many phases of the training school program. One worker, when asked about her role said,

> The trouble with casework in the training school is that you are only permitted to work with a small segment of the child's life.

Questionnaires administered to social workers during the field study elicited responses to the effect that the majority of them conceived of their role as previously defined in this study. That is, they believed

their role included working with the child on an individual basis as well as with other personnel such as cottage parents, however, the margin of this broad perspective was not too great since only about six-tenth fell in this category - the remainder holding to the one-to-one approach. The actual question asked regarding this was as follows: Is your role at present chiefly concerned with a one-to-one relationship with the child or working with other persons involved in the child's life such as parents, teachers, employers, psychiatrists, and others. The respondents were asked to select one of the items included in the question or state one of their own. Only eight chose to do the latter. Of those who did choose to make their own statements, the responses tended to be composed of a combination of the two items included in the question actually asked. Data from workers' responses to this question are presented in Table 4. Item A refers to the one-to-one counselling relationship with the child. Item B refers to working with other persons involved in the child's life such as parents, teachers, employers, psychiatrists, and others. Item C refers to those who chose to state their own category. The workers were also asked in which role did they believe that they could be of the greatest benefit to the delinquent child. To answer this question, they were asked to select one of the items included in the above questions or they were requested to make their own. The majority of the workers, six-tenth, chose to develop their own category by stating that they felt that both were of equal importance. About one-third said that they felt that they could help the child most by adhering to the one-to-one relationship with the

child on an individual basis. The remainder did not respond to this question. Table 5 shows the situation regarding responses to this question.

TABLE 4

SOCIAL WORKERS' ROLE CONCEPTIONS

Social Work Group	No.	A	B	C	No Answer	Total
After-Care	32	12	17	1	2	32
Institutional	19	8	10	1	0	19
Totals	51	20	27	2	2	51

A-One-to-one counselling relationship with child.

B-Working with other persons involved in the child's life such as parents, teachers, cottage personnel, psychiatrists, etc.

C-Others.

TABLE 5

SOCIAL WORKERS OPINIONS AS TO THE ROLE IN WHICH THEY CAN BE OF THE GREATEST SERVICE TO THE DELINQUENT CHILD

Social Work Groups	No.	A	B	C	No Answer	Total
After-Care	32	4	6	20	2	32
Institutional	19	5	6	8	0	19
Totals	51	9	12	28	2	51

A-One-to-One counselling relationship with the child.

B-Working with other persons involved in the child's life such as parents, teachers, employers, psychiatrists, cottage parents, etc.

C-A combination of A and B.

Workers were also asked to give their opinions as to the effect of the training school program on their ability to perform adequately. The intent was to determine whether or not the social workers saw the authoritative nature of the training school program as one that placed frustration-producing limits on them. (In answer to the question the respondents were asked to give their reaction to working in an authoritative agency by choosing one of three items.) The actual phrases used in the study were these: "Seriously handicapped," "somewhat handicapped," "creates almost no problem."

Almost three-fourths of the workers, both, after-care and institutional, stated that working in an authoritative agency created almost no problem for them. Insofar as performing competent and ethical social work is concerned, about one-fifth felt that they were somewhat handicapped. The remainder felt that they were seriously handicapped. Table 6 shows the workers' responses to this question.

TABLE 6

SOCIAL WORKERS OPINIONS REGARDING THEIR ABILITY TO DO COMPETENT AND ETHICAL WORK IN AN AUTHORITATIVE AGENCY

Social Work Groups	Number	A	B	C	No Answer
Institutional	19	0	5	13	1
After-Care	32	1	4	24	3
Totals	51	1	9	37	4

A-Seriously Handicapped.

B-Somewhat Handicapped.

C-Creates Almost no Problem.

To secure additional data regarding respondents' attitudes toward their role, an open-end question was included to provide the opportunity for the workers to give a natural and spontaneous answer in whatever frame of reference they preferred. They were asked to list some of the advantages and disadvantages of their present work. In reviewing the respondents' replies, it was found that categories could be set up. The responses showed that over ninety per cent of the workers conceived of some advantages in working in juvenile agencies. Less than two per cent said that they could see no advantages in their present work.

The nineteen institutional workers listed thirty-two advantages, which fell in six broad categories as shown in Table 8. It was noted

TABLE 7

ADVANTAGES EXPRESSED BY INSTITUTIONAL WORKERS*

Categories	Number
Clients Readily Available	13
Good Cooperation Between Workers and Other Staff	6
Personal Advantage from Working with People and their Problems	4
Good Opportunity to Develop Professionally	8
Totals	31

*Sixteen of the Nineteen workers gave at least one Advantage.

that onlya few refused to answer the questions. Most of the after-care workers said, in effect, that work in this area is advantageous because it provides a wide variety of experiences in working with people who have problems. For example, it was very common to see in the questionnaires a statement to the effect that "we see all of the problem," implying that they came in contact with the family, the community law enforcement agencies, and other forces that affect human behavior. Many of the after-care workers said that they were able to "try out new skills." They saw this as an advantage. As a rule the after-care workers tended to list more advantages than did the institutional workers.

Regarding advantages in working in agencies treating delinquents, the institutional workers tended to feel that the most outstanding asset was in having the client readily available whenever needed. Many said, in essence, that they did not have to lose time looking for clients. One worker said

> If I schedule a boy for an interview, I do not have to just hope that he will be there.

The thirty-two after-care respondents listed fifty-one advantages that tended to fall in four broad categories which are listed as shown in Table 7.

TABLE 8

ADVANTAGES EXPRESSED BY AFTER-CARE WORKERS*

Categories	Number
Adequate Opportunities to do Intensive Casework	14
Personal Satisfaction from Helping People	15
Adequate Opportunities to do Family-Centered Casework	5
Adequate Climate for Professional Growth	12
Totals	46

*Twenty-eight of the thirty-two respondents gave at least one Advantage.

Regarding disadvantages, the thirty-two after-care workers listed a total of seventy items which were placed in seven broadly defined categories. Such is shown by Table 9.

TABLE 9

DISADVANTAGES EXPRESSED BY AFTER-CARE WORKERS*

Categories	Number
Caseloads too Large.	24
Salaries too low.	8
Lack of Cooperation Between After-Care and Institutional Agencies.	10
Indifferent Attitudes on the Part of the General Public toward Delinquency.	9
State Laws Inadequate.	3
Lack of Cooperation Between Judges, Police, and the Agencies.	8
Not enough Resources to Assist the Clients	8
Total	70

*Twenty-nine workers responded to this question; three did not.

The nineteen institutional workers gave a total of thirty-two disadvantages which were placed in five categories. Such is shown by Table 10.

TABLE 10

DISADVANTAGES EXPRESSED BY INSTITUTIONAL WORKERS*

Categories	Number
Lack of Cooperation Between the Various Departments of the Institution	10
Clients are Difficult to reach because they do not ask to come to the Agency	2
Excessive Caseloads	9
Salaries too low	5
Working with Clients in an Artificial Environment	6
Total	32

*Seventeen of the respondents gave at least one disadvantage.

CHAPTER VIII

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF SERVICES

A study of this type could hardly be complete without giving some consideration to suggestions from those individuals closest to the problem. Then too, if any changes are to be made for improving services to delinquents, they will have to be made with those who are most directly involved instead of for them. Therefore, this part of the project was designed to allow for as much freedom of expression as possible.

Interviews conducted suggested that social workers conceived of a situation in which much improvement could be made and was badly needed. Some were hesitant about expressing their opinions in regard to improving services because they felt that nothing would be done about the conditions. However, many did cooperate very well, over and above what was asked of them.

The responses from interviews with the workers tended to show concern about the following areas: Specialization for those working in juvenile agencies, adequacy of the social work curriculum, and in-service training. Questionnaires administered to social workers elicited an appreciable number of responses relative to all of these areas. Some of the respondents saw this as a chance to express their feelings without revealing themselves personally - they were not required to give their names. In almost all cases the responses were relevant to the purpose of the study.

One does not have to be connected with a juvenile agency very long

before the question of specialization comes up from a social work viewpoint. This is a matter that is discussed by professional social workers who have taken jobs with such agencies as well as other employees in official agencies. Novick in his proposed plan for extending the social worker's role stated that the profession of social work is in need of a new specialization to cope with the training school problem.[1] However, there are other people who feel convinced of no need for a specialization for the juvenile agency.

Flynn, has this to say

> To introduce at this stage a specialization in work with juvenile delinquents would be to turn the clock backward. The trend is clearly against this; the progress toward a planned program of generic education cannot and should not be interrupted. However, the development of a totally generic education program must not become so restrictive that it crowds from the curriculum, any reference to a special field. Educators should rather attempt to maintain a balance between what they consider true educational goals and the specific demands of the field.[2]

Social workers in regard to the above question were about equally divided. That is, of those who had at least one year of training in a school of social work, about one-half said that they felt some type of specialization is needed, whereas, others stated that the generic approach is sufficient. Responses are shown by Table 11. Two of the workers stated that they thought social group work would be best; the remaining workers did not commit themselves either way.

---

[1] Op. cit.

[2] Frank T. Flynn, "First Steps in Solving Training Needs of Court and Institutional Workers who Treat Juvenile Delinquents," Training Personnel for Work with Juvenile Delinquents, (United States Children's Bureau Publication, Washington, 1954), p. 73.

TABLE 11

OPINIONS REGARDING SPECIALIZATION AND GENERIC SOCIAL WORK*

Social Work Groups	No	Items		
		Specialization	Generic	No Response
Institutional	13	7	6	
After-Care	21	10	9	2
Totals	34	17	15	2

*Only those workers who had formal training in social work are included.

When asked to state whether or not they believed that the social work curriculum as generqlly used is adequate to prepare compteent personnel for work with delinquents, over three-fourths of the workers expressed negative opinions. That is, three-fourths of the social workers who participated in the study believed that the schools of social work do not properly prepare personnel for work with delinquents. Table 12 shows this. Only those who had at least one year of training in a school of social work were considered in analyzing responses to this question.

TABLE 12

OPINIONS REGARDING THE SOCIAL WORK CURRICULUM

Social Work Groups	No	Items	
		Adequate	Inadequate
Institutional	13	3	10
After-Care	21	3	18
Totals	34	6	28

The workers who feel that the social work curriculum is not adequate were asked to make suggestions as to how it may be improved. There was a wide variety of suggestions, but the majority tended to believe that the addition of courses directly concerned with jubenile delinquency would greatly improve the situation. In fact, over half of the respondents were of this opinion. The respondents greatly favored the increasing of field work placements in correctional agencies as a means of improving the conditions.

Table 13 shows the respondents suggestions categorized. These categories are broad so as to include all of the suggestions made by the respondents.

TABLE 13

OPINIONS REGARDING IMPROVEMENT OF THE SOCIAL WORK CURRICULUM

Categories	Number
Additional Courses Related to Delinquency	18
More Field Placements in Correctional Agencies	13
More Emphasis in the Schools on Social Work in Authoritative Agencies	9
Totals	40

There is another factor involved in the respondents' suggestions for improvement of the social work curriculum that should be discussed here. It was indicated earlier that the respondents were almost equally divided in regard to specialization in social work as it relates to work with delinquents. That is, about half of the respondents believed that a specialization for work with delinquents is needed, and the other half believed that the generic approach is sufficient. A close look at the respondents' suggestions for improving the curriculym will shed more light on this question. As has been indicated, the majority of the respondents believed that additional courses directly related to delinquency, and more field placements in correctional agencies should be

utilized in order to make the curriculum more adequate. To do this would not necessarily require an additional specialization. This adds weight to the belief that generic social work is adequate for preparing personnel for work with delinquents. Johnson, in reference to this situation, says that

> Certain modifications or additions to curriculums are essential for adequate training (i.e., the role of law, problems of treatment in the authoritative setting, and the need to go out to clients).[1]

This brings us to a consideration of the respondents' attitudes regarding in-service training as a means of improving their services. The responses of the social workers in regard to in-service training revealed that they strongly feel that there is a definite need for it. Their suggestions spread over a wide range especially regarding the method to be employed. Their suggestions covered the usual gamut of devices employed in in-service training programs, lectures, conferences, work shops, institutes, seminars and all the others. There was not much agreement as to methods to be employed. There was, however, a fairly high degree of consensus as to what should be the point of such training. Many of the workers believed that in-service training should be focused toward improving and strengthening relationships between agencies and various departments within the agencies. The institutional workers believed that the type of in-service training that would be most useful to them would be that designed to develop a better working relationship between the many departments within the schools as well as the after-care

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 56.

agencies and the courts. The After-care workers generally believed the same. They were interested in some type of in-service training that would bridge the gap between after-care case workers and the institutions. They also saw the need for training that would create a better understanding between after-care caseworkers and the community, and between after-care caseworkers and the agencies. It was frequently seen that respondents desired training that would make for a better working relationship between them and the courts, and law enforcement officers.

The respondents also felt that in-service training would be valuable in increasing their knowledge, skills, and techniques. Their opinions as to how they would best benefit from in-service training are categorized in Table 14. The categories are as follows: Increasing knowledge, skills and techniques, better cooperation between agencies, and increasing public understanding of juvenile delinquency. As to methods for conducting this training, the respondents suggestions tended to fall in six categories which are as follows: Films, workshops, consultation, lectures, demonstrations, and inter-agency meetings. Such is shown in Table 15.

TABLE 14

OPINIONS REGARDING THE APPROPRIATE FOCUS OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING

Categories	Number
To Increase Skills, Knowledge and Techniques	12
To bring about a better Relationship between Institutions and After-Care Agencies	5
To Increase Public Understanding of the Delinquency Problem	4
To bring about a better Working Relationship Between the Various Departments of the School and/or Agencies	9
Total	30

TABLE 15

OPINIONS REGARDING METHODS TO BE UTILIZED IN CONDUCTING IN-SERVICE TRAINING

Methods	Number
Lecture	6
Consultation	4
Demonstration	2
Inter-Agency Meeting	1
Workshop	1
Film	1
Total	15

CHAPTER IX

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

This exploratory study was directed toward developing effective rehabilitation programs in juvenile correctional agencies with particular emphasis on the use of social work in such settings. In view of the study findings, three situations are identified as highly significant for rehabilitative achievement through appropriate use of social work personel. They are institutional goals, role conceptions, and suggestions for improvement of services. Each of these were considered in view of the study emphasis.

Officially defined goals for the training school are care, training, treatment, and supervision after release. Information as to which, if either, of these goals are considered more important is lacking. The goal of treatment implies that rehabilitation for improved social functioning on the part of the individual is the primary goal of the training school.

By inference, it seems that social workers see the training school as a resource for increasing overall individual social functioning. They believe that this aim can best be accomplished by use of an individualized treatment plan. In this study sample there was almost complete agreement relative to treatment as the most appropriate way whereby the training school may achieve its goal. The workers, however, were not in accord with the how of treatment. Their opinions were divided among three different approaches: (1) helping the child in his relationships with adults and peers, (2) changing attitudes and values, and (3) help in

solving basic character and emotional problems. The workers were almost equally divided on these three approaches. The approach concerning attitudes and values maintained a very small margin over the other two approaches.

The officially defined role of the juvenile agency social worker encompasses several dimensions. These generally include work with the child on an individual basis, consultation to personnel as well as lay people, and maintaining contact with the child's family. The social workers were almost equally divided in their opinions on this question. Almost half supported the traditional one-to-one approach. The other conceived of their role as including work with the child on an individual basis, work with the staff, and consultation work. The majority of the workers desired that their role include the several dimensions mentioned above. That is, they believe that their greatest service can be provided the delinquent child if they function in this capacity. Over three fourths of the workers were of this opinion.

The majority, three fourth of the workers, did not see the authoritative nature of juvenile agencies as creating a problem inasmuch as performing competent and ethical social work is concerned. Almost four fifths of the workers were of this opinion.

The workers were divided in their opinions regarding specialization in social work with reference to juvenile correctional agencies. However, indications from their suggestions as to how the curriculum may be improved indicate that they do not really see a need for another specialization. Instead, they see the need for additional courses directly related

to juvenile delinquency and more field work placements.

Almost all of the workers felt a great need for in-service training. They see it as means of increasing their knowledge, skills, and techniques; developing better cooperation between agencies, and increasing public understanding of juvenile delinquency. In-service training designed to increase knowledge, skills, and techniques received the most support. They feel that the appropriate methods of conducting in-service training are consultation, demonstrations, inter-agency meetings, workshops, lectures and films. Of these the lecture method received the most support.

The workers believe that their work has advantages as well as disadvantages. Relative to the former, the after-care workers' opinions were clustered into four broad, somewhat overlapping categories such as good opportunities to do intensive casework, personal satisfaction from helping people, good opportunity to do family centered casework, and an adequate climate for professional growth. Of these, personal satisfaction from helping people was the one most frequently mentioned. The institutional workers' opinions were clustered in four broad categories such as, readily available clients, cooperation between workers and other staff, personal advantages from working with people and their problems, and opportunities to develop professional competence. Of these advantages, having the client readily available when needed was the one most frequently mentioned.

In respect to disadvantages, the after-care workers saw many which tended to fall in seven broad somewhat overlapping categories such as

excessive caseloads, salaries too low, lack of cooperation between after-care and institutional agencies, inadequate state law, indifferent attitudes on the part of the general public toward delinquency, lack of co-operation between judges, police officers and agencies, and not enough resources to assist the clients. Of these the factor of excessive caseloads was most frequently mentioned. In fact, almost three fourths of the workers listed this as a disadvantage.

The institutional workers opinions in respect to disadvantages tended to fall in five general categories such as lack of cooperation between the various departments of the institutions, difficulty in reaching clients because they do not ask to come to the agency, excessive caseloads, low salaries, and working with clients in an artificial environment. Of these, the factor of the lack of cooperation between the various departments of the institutions was most frequently mentioned. The excessive caseload factor ranked second.

Generalizations based on a study with limitations such as this one had must be regarded with skepticism. Granted, the quantative method employed permits questions about validity and reliability of findings. However, there are other factors that offer reassurance. One is the high degree of consistency of some of the study findings. The other is the rate of response to the questionnaires, which was almost fifty per cent. This is rather unusual especially when no follow-up is conducted.

From the study findings it appears that attitudes of social workers are conducive toward developing effective rehabilitation programs in juvenile correctional agencies. However, it is important that other

personnel who work in such settings hold similar attitudes.

The workers voiced come discontent with existing conditions. It seems that formal administrative action may help to resolve the source of some of this discontent. However, certain attitudes observed here are distant from and not likely to be influenced considerably by official action, but they are significant with regard to effective training school operation.

Most of the social workers involved in this study believed that the authoritative nature of the training school does not create a serious problem in regard to performing competent and ethical social work. Since this is the situation, it appears that the field of social work may have a source of information which can be utilized to resolve some of the confusion around the use of authority.

Appendix A

"Attitudes of Social Workers in New York State Training Schools and After-Care Agencies"

Questionnaire

Part I

Sex_____Age_____ Exact Title of Your Position _____

_____ _____ How long have you held this position ____

How long have you been working with delinquent children _____

How long have you worked as a social worker ____What undergraduate degree do you hold, (B.A., B.S., etc. _____What was your major in undergraduate school _____Have you ever attended a graduate or professional school ____ If so, for how long _____ Were you a full time or part student _____.

Major in graduate or professional school _____

Degree obtained (M.S., M.A., M.S.W., etc.) _____

Part II

At the present time you are working in an - Institution ( ) After-Care Agency ( )

Listed below are several possible goals for a training school to pursue. Check those which you believe to be most appropriate. Please rank them in order of importance. Number one (1) should be the one that you believe to be most appropriate; number two (2) should be the one that you believe to be the second most appropriate one etc. You do not have to check all of the items listed.

( ) Teaching vocational skills and knowledge

( ) Teaching academic subjects

( ) Helping the child in his relationships with adults and peers

( ) Changing attitudes and values

( ) Deterrent to other children

( ) Teaching acceptable habits and behavior

( ) Protection of the community

( ) Punishment

( ) Removal from delinquent environment

( ) Help in solving basic character and emotional problems

( ) Deterrent to future delinquency on account of fear of future institutionalization.

Part III

Your role at present is chiefly concerned with (Check one):

After-Care Workers Only

A. ( ) One to one counselling relationship with the child

B. ( ) Working with other persons involved in the child's life such as parents, teachers, employer, psychiatrists etc.

C. ( ) Others: _____

Institutional Workers Only

A. ( ) Counselling relationship with the child individually or in groups

B. ( ) Working with other people involved in the child's life such as teachers, cottage parents, psychiatrists, activity workers etc.

C. ( ) Others: _____

In which of the above roles do you believe that you could be of greatest benefit to the delinquent child?

A. ( ) B. ( ) C. ( )

Part IV

In your opinion to be effective in working with delinquents, social workers should be trained in which of the following:

A. ( ) General case work B. ( ) A particular phase of case

work such as psychiatric case work or child welfare etc. C. ( ) Social group work

D. ( ) Others (specify) _____

_____

Part V

In view of the fact that you are working in an authoritative agency, how do you feel in regard to possibilities to perform competent and ethical social work:

( ) Seriously handicapped ( ) Somewhat handicapped ( ) Creates almost no problems

Part VI

Do you believe that the present social work curriculum as generally used is adequate to prepare competent personnel for work with delinquents?

Yes _____ No _____

If your answer to the above question was no, please make suggestions as to how the curriculum may be improved: _____

_____

_____

_____

What type of In-Service training do you believe would help you in your work?

_____

_____

_____

List the professional and other relevant organizations in which you hold membership such as the National Probation and Parole Association, National

Association of Social Workers, etc.: _____

_____

Part VII

What are some of the advantages of your work? _____

_____

_____

_____

What are some of the disadvantages of your present work? _____

_____

_____

_____

Use the space below for suggestions as to how we may improve our services.

You may also write in the back of this page if you desire to do so:

Appendix B

TABLE 16

CHARACTERISTICS OF SOCIAL WORK GROUPS

Social Work Groups	Charactistics				
	No.	Age Median	Ed. Median[1]	Tenure Median[2]	Affiliation[3]
After-Care	32	35	18	1	21
Institutional	19	34	17	1	11

[1]Median School Grades completed.

[2]Median Years employed in Training School System.

[3]Number belonging to professional or related organizations.

Appendix C

DEFINITION OF TERMS[1]

Children

The terms child and children, as used throughout this subject refer to all children and youth served by institutions for juvenile delinquents. In discussing the child, the singular includes the plural, the plural the singular, and the masculine the feminine, when consistent with the content of the statement.

Treatment

The term treatment indicates the means of accomplishing the goal of rehabilitation held for each child in institutional care.

After-Care Supervision

After-care supervision is a legal status under which the child in delinquency case is permitted to return to his home after a period of foster care, but under the supervision of a worker who may or may not be attached to the agency or institution which provided the foster care.

Social Worker

The term social worker as used in this project refers to all individuals employed as youth parole workers in training schools maintained by the State of New York.

---

[1]United States Children's Bureau, Institutions Serving Delinquent Children: Guides and Goals, (Washington 1956), pp. 118 - 119.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Fink, Arthur. Conover, Merrill and Wilson, Everett. The Field of Social Work. 3rd ed. New York: Henry Holt and Company, (1955).

Friedlander, Walter A. Introduction to Social Welfare. New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., (1955).

Hamilton, Gordon. Theory and Practice of Social Casework. Rev. 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University Press, (1951).

Klienberg, Otto. Social Psychology. Rev. ed. New York: Henry Holt and Company, (1954).

Young, Pauline V. Scientific Social Surveys and Research. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., (1939).

Miscellaneous Material

Catlett, Norman. Care of Training Guides and Goals for Staff of The Otisville Training School. Otisville, New York: Otisville Training School for Boys, 1958. (Mimeographed).

Hill, Benjamin, J. Otisville Training School for Boys. Otisville, New York: Otisville Training School for Boys, 1959, (Mimeographed).

Roger, Lind and Robert Vinter. Staff Relationships in a Juvenile Correctional Institution. University of Michigan School of Social Work Publication. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, 1958.

Public Documents

United States Children's Bureau. - Institutions Serving Delinquent Children. Washington: Government Printing Office. 1956.

United States Children's Bureau. Training Personnel for Work with Juvenile Delinquents. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1954.

New York State Department of Social Welfare. Social Welfare Law of the State of New York. Albany: 1959.

Articles

Hardman, Dale G. and M. P. "Three Postulates in Institutional Care, "National Probation and Parole Journal. IV (January, 1958),22-26.

Johnson, Kenneth D. "The Role of Social Work in Preparing Personnel for the Correctional Field." Federal Probation, VII (September, 1956), 51-58.

Trecker, Harleigh B. "Social Work Principles in Probation," Federal Probation, XIX (March, 1955), 6-12.

Ziskind, Louis. "Social Work in the Correctional Field." Federal Probation, XIV (March, 1950), 46-51.

Unpublished Material

Zirin, Sidney. "Otisville Training School: The First Year." Unpublished Master's thesis, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, 1959.

Novick, Abraham. "Casework in Public Training Schools for Delinquents," Paper presented to the 83rd Annual Forum, National Conference of Social Work, St. Louis, Missouri, May 23, 1956.